arXiv:1204.1929v1 [math.AG] 9 Apr 2012

On the Rigidity of BN-sheaves

R. Weissauer

March 2, 2013

Let X be an abelian variety over an algebraically closed field k, assuming that either $k=\mathbb{C}$ or that k is the algebraic closure of a finite field. In [BN] and [W2] we considered the convolution product $K*L$ for complexes K and L in the bounded derived category $D^b_c(X,\Lambda)$ where the coefficient field Λ is either $\mathbb{C}$ for $k=\mathbb{C}$ or $\Lambda=\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_l$. The convolution product is defined, using the group law $a : X\times X\to X$ of the abelian variety X, as the derived direct image complex $K*L=Ra_*(K\boxtimes L)$. This convolution product makes $(D^b_c(X,\Lambda),*)$ into a rigid triangulated symmetric monoidal Λ-linear category; its unit object is the skyscraper sheaf δ_0 concentrated at zero. For further details we refer to [W2]. For a complex K let $D(K)$ denote its Verdier dual and $K^\vee=(-id_X)^*D(K)$ its rigid dual.

For most of our applications the decomposition theorem and the hard Lefschetz theorem for perverse sheaves are essential perequisites. For this reason we specify a full triangulated Λ-linear tensor subcategory $(\mathbf{D},*)\subseteq(D^b_c(X,\Lambda),*)$ as in [KrW, example 6] so that among others objects in $\mathbf{D}$ are semisimple, the decomposition theorem holds and also the hard Lefschetz theorem. In particular there is a perverse t-structure and perverse cohomology functors ${}^pH^i(K)\in\mathbf{P}$ are defined for K in $\mathbf{D}$, where $\mathbf{P}\subset\mathbf{D}$ is an abelian subcategory of perverse sheaves defined by a perverse t-structure on $\mathbf{D}$ with core $\mathbf{P}$. If we speak of perverse sheaves on X we always mean objects in this category $\mathbf{P}$. Furthermore $\mathbf{D}$ and $\mathbf{P}$ are stable under twists $K\mapsto K_\chi=K\otimes_{\Lambda_X}L_\chi$ with respect to local systems L_χ defined by the characters χ of the fundamental group $\pi_1(X,0)$ of X in the sense of [KrW] and stable under $K\mapsto T_x^*(K)$ for translations $T_x(y)=y+x$ with respect to closed points $x\in X$.

Evaluation morphisms. We discuss properties of the symmetric monoidal rigid triangulated Λ-linear tensor category $(\mathbf{D},*)$ with the tensor product $*$ defined by the convolution (see [BN] and [KrW], also for the notations used). The indecomposable objects K in $\mathbf{D}$ have the form $K=P[n]$ for irreducible $P\in\mathbf{P}$ and

$n \in \mathbb{Z}$. Every object in $\mathbf{D}$ decomposes into a finite direct sum of indecomposables. Since $End_{\mathbf{P}}(P[n]) \cong \Lambda \cdot id_{P[n]}$, the Krull-Schmidt theorem holds in $\mathbf{D}$. By rigidity [W2] for an *irreducible* perverse sheaf K on an abelian variety X in $\mathbf{P}$ there exists a coevaluation morphism

$$coev_K : \delta_0 \to K * K^\vee$$

corresponding to the identity id_K via $Hom_{D^b_c(X,\Lambda)}(K,K) = Hom_{D^b_c(X,\Lambda)}(\delta_0, K * K^\vee)$. Similarly one has the evaluation morphism

$$eval_K : K^\vee * K \to \delta_0$$

so that the composition of the induced morphisms $(id_K * eval_K) \circ ass \circ (coev_K * id_K)$

$$K = \delta_0 * K \to (K * K^\vee) * K \to K * (K^\vee * K) \to K * \delta_0 = K$$

is the identity morphism $id_K : K \to K$. There is a similar dual identity for $K^\vee$.

Remark. $(K^\vee, eval_K)$ attached to an object K is unique up to isomorphism (see [CT,p.120]). We use this together with the following simple facts (see [D,1.15]).

a) Suppose K is a retract of L defined by an idempotent $e \in End_{\mathbf{D}}(L)$ admitting a direct sum (i.e. biproduct) decomposition. Then for $K^\vee$, considered as a retract of $L^\vee$ defined via the dual idempotent $e^\vee$, this gives a retract $\iota : K^\vee * K \hookrightarrow L^\vee * L$ so that $eval_K = eval_L \circ \iota$ holds.

b) For $K = A \oplus B$ the evaluation $eval_K$ is obtained as $eval_A + eval_B$ using the projection $K^\vee * K \twoheadrightarrow (A^\vee * A) \oplus (B^\vee * B)$.

c) For $K = A * B$ using $K^\vee * K = (A * B)^\vee * (A * B) \cong (A^\vee * A) * (B^\vee * B)$ the evaluation morphism of $K^\vee * K \to \delta_0$ is obtained as the tensor product $eval_K = eval_A * eval_B$.

The symmetry constraints of the tensor category define isomorphisms

$$S : K * K^\vee \cong K^\vee * K$$

such that the composed morphism $eval_K \circ S \circ coev_K$

$$\delta_0 \to K * K^\vee \to K^\vee * K \to \delta_0 \ ,$$

considered as an element of $Hom_{\mathbf{D}}(\delta_0, \delta_0) = \Lambda$, is the multiplication with the categorial dimension of K; in our case the categorial dimension is the Euler characteristic $\chi(K) = \sum_i (-1)^i \dim_\Lambda(H^i(X,K))$ of the complex K.

For a morphism $\rho : K \to L$ the transposed morphism $\rho^\vee : L^\vee \to K^\vee$ is defined as $(eval_L * id_{K^\vee}) \circ (id_{L^\vee} * \rho * id_{K^\vee}) \circ (id_{L^\vee} * coev_K)$. Together with $K \mapsto K^\vee$ this induces a tensor equivalence with the opposite category so that $(K^\vee)^\vee \cong K$ and $(\rho^\vee)^\vee = \rho$ in the sense of [CT,2.5]. There exists an isomorphism $\varphi : (K^{\vee\vee} * K^\vee)^\vee \cong K * K^\vee$ such that $coev_K = \varphi \circ (eval_{K^\vee})^\vee$. Using the duality isomorphisms $d_{K,L} : L^\vee * K^\vee \to (K * L)^\vee$ defined by $(eval_L * id_{(K*L)^*}) \circ (id_{L^\vee} * eval_K * id_L * id_{(K*L)^\vee}) \circ (id_{L^\vee} * id_{K^\vee} * coev_{K*L})$ more concretely $(coev_K)^\vee \circ D = eval_{K^\vee}$ for $D = d_{K,K^\vee}$.

Prime components. By the decomposition theorem $K^\vee * K$ is semisimple. Hence $K^\vee * K = \bigoplus_i {}^pH^i(K^\vee * K)[-i]$ and any ${}^pH^i(K^\vee * K)$ decomposes into a direct sum $\bigoplus P_\nu^i$ of irreducible perverse sheaves P_ν^i. Using this decomposition the evaluation can be written as a sum $eval_K = \sum_{\nu,i} ev_{\nu,i}$ with morphisms $ev_{\nu,i} \in Hom_{\mathbf{D}}(P_\nu^i[-i], \delta_0)$. Since

$$Hom_{\mathbf{D}}(K,K) = Hom_{\mathbf{D}}(K^\vee * K, \delta_0)$$

has dimension one, there exists a unique exponent $i = \nu_K$ and a unique simple perverse constituent $\mathscr{P}_K$ of ${}^pH^i(K * K^\vee)$ such that $eval_K$ factorizes over $\mathscr{P}_K[-i]$. All the other morphisms $ev_{\nu,i}$ are zero. This gives a commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
K^\vee * K \arrow[dr, "eval_K"] \arrow[dd, shift left, two heads, "p"] & \\
& \delta_0 \\
\mathscr{P}_K[-\nu_K] \arrow[uu, shift left, hook, "\iota"] \arrow[ur, "\rho"'] &
\end{tikzcd}$$

where $p \circ \iota = id$ is the identity morphism. In the following arrows $\hookrightarrow$ and $\twoheadrightarrow$ always indicate retracts ι and the corresponding projections p obtained from direct sum decompositions, which makes sense in any Λ-linear tensor category $(\mathbf{D}, *)$. Since for an arbitrary rigid symmetric monoidal Λ-linear tensor category $eval_K = 0$ implies $id_K = 0$ and hence $K = 0$, this shows $\rho \neq 0$.

The distinguished irreducible component $\mathscr{P}_K$ will be called the *prime component* of the irreducible perverse sheaf K and ν_K its degree, and in the case $\nu_K > 0$ the perverse sheaf $\mathscr{P}_K$ will be called a prime perverse sheaf or *prime* on X. Notice that the degree always satisfies $\nu_K \geq 0$.

This follows from the perverse vanishing conditions

$$Hom_{\mathbf{D}}(M, N[r]) = 0$$

for $M,N \in \mathbf{P}$ and $r < 0$, applied for the objects $\mathscr{P}_K$ and δ_0 in $\mathbf{P}$.

From the definition of $\mathscr{P}_K[\nu_K]$ and the existence of the symmetry isomorphism $S : K * K^\vee \cong K^\vee * K$ it is clear that $\mathscr{P}_{K^\vee} \cong \mathscr{P}_K$ and $\nu_{K^\vee} = \nu_K$. Therefore passing to the dual using $coev_K = \varphi \circ (eval_{K^\vee})^\vee$ for some isomorphism $\varphi : (K^{\vee\vee} * K^\vee)^\vee \cong K * K^\vee$ and $\mathscr{P}_K[-\nu_K]^\vee \cong \mathscr{P}_K^\vee[+\nu_K]$ we obtain a commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
 & K * K^\vee \arrow[dd, shift left, two heads, "p'"] \\
\delta_0 \arrow[ur, "coev_K"] \arrow[dr, "\sigma"'] & \\
 & \mathscr{P}_K^\vee[+\nu_K] \arrow[uu, hook, shift left, "\iota'"]
\end{tikzcd}$$

Using the perverse vanishing condition for morphisms and the adjunction formulas

$$Hom_{\mathbf{D}}(K, \delta_0[n]) = \mathscr{H}^{-n}(K)_0^*$$

and $Hom_{\mathbf{D}}(K * L, \delta_0) = Hom_{\mathbf{D}}(L, K^\vee)$ for $K, L \in \mathbf{D}$ it follows that $\mathscr{H}^{>0}(K * L) = 0$ holds for perverse sheaves $K, L \in \mathbf{P}$. Hence the following assertions 5, 6, 7 and 9 of lemma 1 are an immediate consequence in view of the hard Lefschetz theorem.

Lemma 1. *Suppose $K \in \mathbf{P}$ is an irreducible perverse sheaf on X, then*

1. *$\mathscr{P}_K$ is irreducible and $\mathscr{P}_K \cong \mathscr{P}_{K^\vee}$ and $\nu_{K^\vee} \cong \nu_K$.*
2. *$0 \leq \nu_K \leq \dim(X)$, and $\nu_K = \dim(X)$ iff K is translation invariant under X.*
3. *$\nu_K = 0$ iff K is in $M(X)$, i.e. iff $\chi(K) \neq 0$ holds for the Euler characteristic. In this case $\mathscr{P}_K = \delta_0$.*
4. *$\nu_K > 0$ iff K is in $E(X)$, i.e. iff $\chi(K) = 0$.*
5. *$(P, \nu) = (\mathscr{P}_K, \nu_K)$ is uniquely characterized by the property: $P[-\nu]$ is a summand of $K^\vee * K$ with $\mathscr{H}^{-\nu}(P)_0 \neq 0$. We remark that then this stalk is dual to $End_{\mathbf{D}}(K)$ and hence isomorphic to Λ (see also [BN, cor.2]).*
6. *$\mathscr{P}_K[\pm\nu_K]$ has multiplicity one in $K * K^\vee$ and $\mathscr{P}_K[n] \hookrightarrow K^\vee * K$ implies $|n| \leq \nu_K$.*
7. *$x \in supp(\mathscr{H}^0(\mathscr{P}_K[-\nu_K]))$ iff $T_x^*(K) \cong K$ (this describes the stabilizer of K).*
8. *$\nu_{K_\chi} = \nu_K$, $\mu(K) = \mu(K_\chi)$ and $\mathscr{P}_{K_\chi} = (\mathscr{P}_K)_\chi$ for twists K_χ of K.*

9. $\nu_K = \mu(\mathscr{P}_K)$.

where for a complex G in $\mathbf{D}$ *we define*

$$\mu(G) = \max\{\nu \mid \mathscr{H}^{-i}(G) = 0 \textit{ for all } i < \nu\} \ .$$

Proof. For property 8 use that twisting with a character defines a tensor functor (see [KrW]). The symmetry isomorphism $S : K^\vee * K \cong K * K^\vee$ together with property 5 gave $\mathscr{P}_{K^\vee} \cong \mathscr{P}_K$ and $\nu_{K^\vee} = \nu_K$. For property 2 notice that the perverse cohomology of the direct image $Ra_*(K^\vee \boxtimes K)$ vanishes in degree $> \dim(X)$, and for $\nu_K = \dim(X)$ one easily shows $a^*(\mathscr{P}_K)[\dim(X)] \cong K^\vee \boxtimes K$. Hence $\mathscr{P}_K[\dim(X)] \cong K \otimes \mathscr{H}^\bullet(K^\vee)_0$ by restriction to $\{0\} \times X$, and hence $\mathscr{P}_K \cong K$. Then $T_x^*(K) \cong K$ for all $x \in X$ follows by restriction to $\{x\} \times X$. The proof of property 3 and 4 follows from the next commutative diagram, whose right side stems from the hard Lefschetz theorem (see also [BN, 2.6])

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\delta_0 & \mathscr{P}_K[-\nu_K] \arrow[l, "\exists!\ \rho"'] \arrow[d, hook, shift left] \\
K^\vee * K \arrow[u, "eval_K"] & \bigoplus_{\nu=0}^{\nu_K} \mathscr{P}_K[2\nu-\nu_K] \ \oplus\ rest \arrow[l, "\sim"'] \arrow[u, two heads, shift left, "pr_{-\nu_K}"] \\
K * K^\vee \arrow[u, "S"] \arrow[r, "\sim"] & \bigoplus_{\nu=0}^{\nu_K} \mathscr{P}_K[2\nu-\nu_K] \ \oplus\ rest \arrow[u, "\sim"'] \arrow[d, dotted, two heads, shift left] \\
\delta_0 \arrow[u, "coev_K"] \arrow[r, "\exists!\ \sigma"] \arrow[uuu, bend left=60, "\chi(K)"] & \mathscr{P}_K^\vee[+\nu_K] \arrow[u, dotted, hook, shift left, "i_{+\nu_K}"]
\end{tikzcd}$$

The two middle horizontal arrows define $\bigoplus_{\nu=0}^{\nu_K} \mathscr{P}_K[2\nu-\nu_K]$ as a retract of $K * K^\vee$ using $S : K * K^\vee \cong K^\vee * K$. The middle vertical arrow on the right is an isomorphism respecting the direct sum decomposition $\bigoplus_{\nu=0}^{\nu_K} \mathscr{P}_K[2\nu-\nu_K] \ \oplus\ rest$. The existence of such a decomposition follows from the hard Lefschetz theorem, since the symmetry S can be chosen so that it commutes with the Lefschetz maps L. Indeed, by defining the Lefschetz morphism $L : K^\vee * K \to K^\vee * K[2](1)$ as $L = Ra_*(\eta)$ where $\eta : K^\vee \boxtimes K \to K^\vee \boxtimes K[2](1))$ is induced by the cup-product of $K^\vee \boxtimes K$ with the morphism $\Lambda \to \Lambda[2](1)$ defined by an ample theta divisor of $X \times X$ whose Chern class is symmetric with respect to the switch $\sigma_{12}(x_1,x_2) = (x_2,x_1)$, it suffices to know that $S = Ra_*(\psi)$ holds for some isomorphism $\psi : K^\vee \boxtimes K \cong \sigma_{12}^*(K \boxtimes K^\vee)$.

For this see [BN, 2.1]. Since $coev_K : \delta_0 \to K^\vee * K$ factorizes over $\mathscr{P}_K^\vee[+\nu_K]$ and since $Hom_{\mathbf{D}}(\mathscr{P}_K^\vee[+\nu_K], \mathscr{P}_K[-\nu_K])$ vanishes unless $\nu_K \le -\nu_K$ and hence $\nu_K = 0$, this proves assertion 3 and 4 taking into account the discussion of the case $\nu_K = 0$ given in [KrW]. $\square$

We will show $\mathscr{P}_K^\vee \cong \mathscr{P}_K$ later in lemma 3. Using this, the lower right part of the last diagram is contained $\bigoplus_{\nu=0}^{\nu_K} \mathscr{P}_K[2\nu - \nu_K]$ using the fact that both $\mathscr{P}_K[\pm\nu_K]$ appear with multiplicity one as a direct summand in $K^\vee * K$. Notice, that both morphisms ρ and σ are nontrivial morphisms in the category $\mathbf{D}$.

Besides the above 'prime component' diagram there are similar commutative diagrams for semisimple perverse objects P in $\mathbf{P}$.

For $P = \bigoplus_i m_i P_i$ and irreducible $P_i \in \mathbf{P}$ such that $P_i \ncong P_j$ for $i \neq j$ there are commutative diagrams

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\delta_0 \arrow[r, equal] & \delta_0 & \bigoplus_i m_i^2 \cdot \mathscr{P}_{P_i}[-\nu_{P_i}] \arrow[l, "\Sigma_i\ tr\circ\rho_i"'] \\
P^\vee * P \arrow[u, "eval_P"] & \bigoplus_i\ m_i^2 \cdot P_i^\vee * P_i \arrow[l, hook'] \arrow[u, "\Sigma_i\, eval_{P_i}"'] & \bigoplus_i \bigoplus_{\nu=0}^{\nu_{P_i}} m_i^2 \cdot \mathscr{P}_{P_i}[2\nu - \nu_{P_i}] \arrow[l, hook'] \arrow[u, two heads, "\bigoplus_i pr_{-\nu_{P_i}}"']
\end{tikzcd}$$

Also the following diagrams are commutative. Notice, part of the next diagram is displayed already in the last diagram. However, the next two diagrams are commutative also in the reverse direction, i.e. with the additional arrows inserted. This follows from $Hom_{\mathbf{D}}(P_i^\vee * P_j, \delta_0) = Hom_{\mathbf{D}}(P_j, P_i) = 0$ for irreducible $P_i \ncong P_j$ in $\mathbf{P}$. The lower diagram is obtained from the upper one by Tannaka duality

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\delta_0 \arrow[r, equal] & \delta_0 & \bigoplus_i m_i^2 \cdot \mathscr{P}_{P_i}[-\nu_{P_i}] \arrow[l, "\Sigma_i\ tr\circ\rho_i"'] \arrow[d, hook, shift right] \\
P^\vee * P \arrow[u, "eval_P"] \arrow[r, two heads, shift left] & \bigoplus_i\ m_i^2 \cdot P_i^\vee * P_i \arrow[l, hook', shift left] \arrow[u, "\Sigma_i\, eval_{P_i}"'] \arrow[r, two heads, shift left] & \bigoplus_i \bigoplus_{\nu=0}^{\nu_{P_i}} m_i^2 \cdot \mathscr{P}_{P_i}[2\nu - \nu_{P_i}] \arrow[l, hook', shift left] \arrow[u, two heads, shift right, "\bigoplus_i pr_{-\nu_{P_i}}"']
\end{tikzcd}$$

$$\begin{tikzcd}
P * P^\vee \arrow[r, two heads, shift left] & \bigoplus_i\ m_i^2 \cdot P_i * P_i^\vee \arrow[l, hook', shift left] \arrow[r, two heads, shift left] & \bigoplus_i \bigoplus_{\nu=0}^{\nu_{P_i}}\ m_i^2 \cdot \mathscr{P}_{P_i}^\vee[2\nu - \nu_{P_i}] \arrow[l, hook', shift left] \arrow[d, two heads, shift right] \\
\delta_0 \arrow[r, equal] \arrow[u, hook, "coev_P"] & \delta_0 \arrow[u, "\oplus_i coev_{P_i}"'] \arrow[r, "\oplus_i\ tr^\vee\circ\sigma_i"] & \bigoplus_i\ m_i^2 \cdot \mathscr{P}_{P_i}^\vee[+\nu_{P_i}] \arrow[u, hook, shift right, "\bigoplus_i i_{+\nu_{P_i}}"']
\end{tikzcd}$$

Example. For irreducible perverse sheaves K on A and L on B and $K \boxtimes L$ on $A \times B$ we have $\mathscr{P}_{K\boxtimes L} = \mathscr{P}_K \boxtimes \mathscr{P}_L$ and $\nu_{K\boxtimes L} = \nu_K + \nu_L$ so that $\mathscr{H}^{-i}(\mathscr{P}_K \boxtimes \mathscr{P}_L)$ is a skyscraper sheaf with stalk cohomology $\mathscr{H}^{-\nu_K-\nu_L}(\mathscr{P}_K\boxtimes\mathscr{P}_L)_0\cong\Lambda$ at the point zero for $i=\nu_K+\nu_L$, and vanishes for $i<\nu_K+\nu_L$.

Example. An irreducible perverse sheaf K is *negligible*[1] if it has the form

$$K=\delta_B^\psi * M \quad , \quad \delta_B^\psi := i_*(\Lambda_B)[\dim(B)]_\psi$$

for an irreducible $M\in M(X)$ (see also [KrW]), a nontrivial abelian subvariety $i: B\hookrightarrow X$ and a twist by a character $\psi:\pi_1(X,0)\to\Lambda^*$. Then $K*K^\vee\cong(H^\bullet(X,\delta_B)\otimes_\Lambda\delta_B^\psi)*(M*M^\vee)$. This allows to compute $coev_B$ and $coev_M$ separately. Hence the prime component is

$$\boxed{\mathscr{P}_K=\delta_B^\psi \quad , \quad \nu_K=\dim(B)}$$

by assertion 3) of lemma 1. Indeed for an irreducible perverse sheaf $M\in M(X)$ we have $\mathscr{P}_M=\delta_0$. The above formula for ν_K is a special case of

$$\nu_F=\nu_K+\dim(A) \quad , \quad F=p^*(K)[\dim(A)]$$

for quotient morphisms $p:X\to B=X/A$, which by an isogeny is easily reduced to the case $X=A\times B$ where p is the projection to the second factor and $F=\delta_A\boxtimes K$. Then the assertion is obvious. Indeed for $K\boxtimes L$ on $A\times B$ and $K\in Perv(A,\Lambda)$ and $L\in Perv(B,\Lambda)$ one has $\nu_{K\boxtimes L}=\nu_K+\nu_L$.

Tensor ideals. Semisimple complexes, whose irreducible perverse constituents (with shifts) are translation invariant by nontrivial abelian subvarietes, resp. whose constituents have Euler characteristic zero, define tensor ideals $\mathbf{N}$ and $\mathbf{N}_E$ in the tensor category $(\mathbf{D},*)$ so that $\mathbf{N}\subset\mathbf{N}_E$. One can show that a complex K is translation invariant under an abelian subvariety $A\subseteq X$ iff all perverse constituents of all perverse cohomology sheaves ${}^pH^i(K)$ are translation invariant under A. Furthermore by lemma 1, assertion 7 for $\nu_K>0$ an irreducible perverse sheaf is in $\mathbf{N}_E$ but not in $\mathbf{N}$ iff $\mathscr{H}^0(\mathscr{P}_K[-\nu_K])$ is a skyscraper sheaf. Let $E(X)$ resp. $N(X)$ denote the perverse sheaves in $\mathbf{N}_E$ resp. $\mathbf{N}$, and $F(X)$ the isomorphism classes of irreducible perverse K in $E(X)\setminus N(X)$.

Reconstruction. We already know $Hom_{\mathbf{D}}(K^\vee*K,\mathscr{P}_K[-\nu_K])\neq 0$ for irreducible K in $\mathbf{P}$. Hence by rigidity $Hom_{\mathbf{D}}(K,K*\mathscr{P}_K[-\nu_K])\neq 0$, so there exists a nontrivial morphism $K[\nu_K]\to\mathscr{P}_K*K$. Our aim is to show that there exists a retract morphism in $\mathbf{D}$

$$K[\nu_K]\hookrightarrow\mathscr{P}_K*K\ .$$

---

[1] An equivalent definition is, that there exists an isogeny $g:A\times B\to X$ such that $g^*(K)=\tilde{K}\boxtimes\Lambda_B[\dim(B)]$ for some abelian subvariety $B\neq 0$ and some $\tilde{K}\in Perv(A,\Lambda)$

By the decomposition theorem $\mathscr{P}_K * K = \bigoplus_{L,\nu} L[-\nu]$ holds for certain simple perverse sheaves L and $\nu \in \mathbb{Z}$. By the rigidity (and strictness) of the additive category $\mathbf{D}$ the morphism $id_K : K = \delta_0 * K \to K * K^\vee * K \to K * \delta_0 = K$ then 'factorizes' in the form $id_K = \sum_{L,\nu} \mathrm{v}_{L,\nu} \circ u_{L,\nu}$. Hence for some L and some ν

$$\begin{tikzcd}
K = \delta_0 * K \arrow[rr, "coev_K \otimes id_K"] \arrow[rd, "\varphi"] \arrow[rdd, dotted, "\exists\, u"'] & & K * K^\vee * K \arrow[rr, "id_K \otimes eval_K"] & & K * \delta_0 = K \\
 & & \mathscr{P}_K^\vee[\nu_K] * K \arrow[u, hook] \arrow[rru, "\psi"] & & \\
 & & L[\nu_K - \nu] \arrow[u, hook] \arrow[rruu, "\mathrm{v}"'] & &
\end{tikzcd}$$

there exists a nontrivial morphism $u = u_{L,\nu}$ and $\mathrm{v} = \mathrm{v}_{L,\nu}$ in $\mathbf{D}$ as in the diagram, so that $\mathrm{v} \circ u \neq 0$. Warning: The lower left of the diagram may not be commutative.

Existence of a nontrivial morphism v from $L[\nu_K - \nu]$ to $K * \delta_0$ in $\mathbf{D}$ implies $\nu_K - \nu \leq 0$. Existence of a nontrivial morphism u in $\mathbf{D}$ from $\delta_0 * K$ to $L[\nu_K - \nu]$ implies $\nu_K - \nu \geq 0$. Hence $\nu = \nu_K$. That $\mathrm{v} \circ u : K = \delta_0 * K \to L \to K * \delta_0$ is nontrivial then forces u and v to be isomorphisms of perverse sheaves $L \cong K$ by $End_{\mathbf{D}}(K) = \Lambda \cdot id_K$. This proves $K \hookrightarrow \mathscr{P}_K^\vee[\nu_K] * K$ or $K[-\nu_K] \hookrightarrow \mathscr{P}_K^\vee * K$, and hence by the hard Lefschetz theorem

$$\boxed{K[\pm\nu_K] \hookrightarrow \mathscr{P}_K^\vee * K}\ .$$

Applying this for $K^\vee$ instead of K, by passing to the Tannaka duals we then obtain from lemma 1, part 1 the desired assertion

$$\boxed{K[\pm\nu_K] \hookrightarrow \mathscr{P}_K * K}\ .$$

Together with

$$\boxed{\mathscr{P}_K[\pm\nu_K] \hookrightarrow K * K^\vee}$$

this easily implies

Lemma 2. *For irreducible perverse sheaves K in $\mathbf{P}$ and an abelian subvariety $A \subseteq X$ and homomorphisms $f : X \to Y$ the following holds*

1. $Rf_*(K) = 0$ *iff* $Rf_*(\mathscr{P}_K) = 0$.
2. $K \in E(X)$ *iff* $\mathscr{P}_K \in E(X)$.

3. *K is invariant under $A \subseteq X$ iff $\mathscr{P}_K$ is invariant under A.*

4. *$K \in N(X)$ iff $\mathscr{P}_K \in N(X)$.*

5. *$K \in F(X)$ iff $\mathscr{P}_K \in F(X)$.*

Proof. Obviously $3) \Longrightarrow 4)$ and $2),4) \Longrightarrow 5)$. For 1) use that Rf_* is a tensor functor, for 2) use the hereditary property of the class N_{Euler} (see [KrW]), and for 3) use $T_x^*(K * L) = T_x^*(K) * L$ for translations $T_x(y) = x + y$ for closed points $x \in A$ together with $K[\pm\nu_K] \hookrightarrow \mathscr{P}_K * K$ and $\mathscr{P}_K[\pm\nu_K] \hookrightarrow K * K^\vee$. $\square$

Extremal perverse sheaves. For closed points $x \in X$ the skyscraper sheaves δ_x are in $\mathbf{P}$ and $T_x^*(\delta_x) = \delta_0$, and $K \in \mathbf{P}$ iff $T_x^*(K) \in \mathbf{P}$. For K, L in $\mathbf{P}$ the Λ-dual of the stalk cohomology $\mathscr{H}^n(L^\vee * K)_x$ at x can be identified with $Hom_{\mathbf{D}}(L^\vee * K, \delta_x[-n]) = Hom_{\mathbf{D}}(T_x^*(K), L[-n])$, which is zero for $n > 0$ by the perverse vanishing conditions for morphisms. Hence $\mathscr{H}^{>0}(K * \mathscr{P}_K) = 0$. Since $K[\pm\nu_K] \hookrightarrow K * \mathscr{P}_K$, therefore $\mathscr{H}^{>-\nu_K}(K) = \mathscr{H}^{>0}(K[-\nu_K])$ vanishes. For irreducible perverse sheaves K this shows the inequality

$$\boxed{\nu_K \ \leq \ \mu(K)} \, .$$

Suppose $K \in F(X)$ is *extremal* in the sense that $\mathscr{H}^0(K[-\nu_K]) \neq 0$ or equivalently that $\nu_K = \mu(K)$ holds. We claim that

$$\boxed{\nu_K = \mu(K) \iff T_x^*(K) \cong \mathscr{P}_K \ \text{ for some } x \in X} \, .$$

The implication $\Leftarrow$ is clear by lemma 1, part 9. For the converse recall that $K[-\nu_K] \hookrightarrow \mathscr{P}_K * K$ and also $K[-\nu_K] \hookrightarrow \mathscr{P}_K^\vee * K$. Therefore $\nu_K = \mu(K)$ implies $0 \neq \mathscr{H}^0(K[-\nu_K])$ and hence $\mathscr{H}^0(\mathscr{P}_K^\vee * K) \neq 0$. Notice both K and $L = \mathscr{P}_K^\vee$ are irreducible perverse sheaves and for irreducible perverse sheaves K and L one has $\mathscr{H}^0(L * K) \neq 0$ iff $T_x^*(K) \cong L^\vee$ holds for some $x \in X$ (see [BN,2.5] or the computations above). This implies $T_x^*(K) \cong \mathscr{P}_K$ for some $x \in X$ and proves our claim.

If $K = \mathscr{P}$ is a prime perverse sheaf, then K is extremal and furthermore $\mathscr{H}^{-\nu_K}(K)_0 \neq 0$ holds. Therefore the argument above shows more, namely that we get an isomorphism $K \cong \mathscr{P}_K$ already for $x = 0$ from the stronger assertion $\mathscr{H}(K[-\nu_K])_0 \subseteq \mathscr{H}^0(\mathscr{P}_K * K)_0$. However the same argument then applied to the retract $K[-\nu_K] \hookrightarrow \mathscr{P}_K * K$ instead of $K[-\nu_K] \hookrightarrow \mathscr{P}_K^\vee * K$ then also shows $K \cong \mathscr{P}_K^\vee$. Therefore in particular $K^\vee \cong K$ holds for all primes K.

Using this information we get $\mathscr{P}_K^\vee \cong \mathscr{P}_K$ for arbitrary simple perverse K. Hence if K is extremal, then $K^\vee \cong T_{2x}^*(K)$. If K is extremal and self dual in the sense $K^\vee \cong K$, then $T_{2x}^*(K) \cong K$. If K is a prime component, then K is extremal. Altogether this implies

Lemma 3. *For an irreducible perverse sheaf K one has $\nu_K \leq \mu(K)$. K is extremal in the sense $\nu_K = \mu(K)$ iff K is isomorphic to a translate of its prime component. If K is the prime component of an irreducible perverse sheaf, then*

$$\boxed{K^\vee \cong K \cong \mathscr{P}_K}\ .$$

Hence in particular $\nu_K = \mu(\mathscr{P}_K) = \nu_{\mathscr{P}_K}$.

The identity $\mathscr{P}_K \cong K$ for primes $K = \mathscr{P}$ gives the following commutative diagram for a prime K, which uses that $K[\pm d] \hookrightarrow K * K$ occurs with multiplicity one in $K * K$ and also uses $K^\vee \cong K$

$$\begin{tikzcd}
K \arrow[r, "coev_K * id_K"] \arrow[dr, "\sigma * id_K"] \arrow[ddr, "\sim"'] & (K * K^\vee) * K \arrow[r, "ass", "\sim"'] & K * (K^\vee * K) \arrow[r, "id_K * eval_K"] \arrow[d, "id_K * j^\vee"'] & K \\
 & K[+\nu_K] * K \arrow[u, hook, "j * id_K"'] & K * K[-\nu_K] \arrow[ur, "id_K * \rho"] \arrow[d, "p'"'] & \\
 & K \arrow[u, hook, "j'"'] \arrow[r, "\sim"] & K \arrow[uur, "\sim"'] &
\end{tikzcd}$$

for the diagrams

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\delta_0 \arrow[r, "coev_K"] \arrow[dr, "\sigma"'] & K * K^\vee \\
 & K[\nu_K] \arrow[u, hook, "j"']
\end{tikzcd}
\qquad
\begin{tikzcd}
K^\vee * K \arrow[r, "eval_K"] \arrow[d, "j^\vee"'] & \delta_0 \\
K[-\nu_K] \arrow[ur, "\rho"'] &
\end{tikzcd}$$

Functors. For Λ-linear tensor functors F between rigid symmetric monoidal (not necessarily abelian) Λ-linear tensor categories $F(coev_K) = coev_{F(K)}$ and also $F(eval_K) = eval_{F(K)}$ holds. We will use this for the direct image functor $F = Rf_*$ which for a homomorphism between abelian varieties

$$f : X \to Y$$

induces a triangulated tensor functor between $\mathbf{D}(X) \subseteq D_c^b(X, \Lambda)$ and $\mathbf{D}(Y) \subseteq D_c^b(Y, \Lambda)$.

Assumption. Suppose $Rf_*(K)$ is perverse[2]. By the decomposition theorem $Rf_*(K)$ decomposes into nonisomorphic irreducible perverse sheaves P_i with multiplicities m_i

$$\boxed{L := Rf_*(K) = \bigoplus_i\ m_i\cdot P_i}\ .$$

Since Rf_* is a tensor functor

$$Rf_*(K*K^\vee)\ =\ L*L^\vee\ =\ \bigoplus_i m_i^2\cdot P_i*P_i^\vee\ \oplus\ \bigoplus_{i\neq j} m_im_j\cdot P_i*P_j^\vee\ .$$

Using lemma 1, property 5 of prime components and the adjunction formulas from page 4 it is easy to see that any irreducible constituent Q of $L*L^\vee$ with $\mathscr{H}^0(Q)_0\neq 0$ is contained in the first sum $\bigoplus_i m_i^2\cdot P_i*P_i^\vee$, hence is of the form

$$Q\ \cong\ \mathscr{P}_{P_i}[-\nu_{P_i}]\ .$$

Now applying $F=Rf_*$ to the prime diagram of K gives the right side of the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\bigoplus_i m_i^2\cdot\mathscr{P}_{P_i}[-\nu_{P_i}] \arrow[r, "\oplus_i\ tr\circ\rho_i"] & \delta_0 & Rf_*\mathscr{P}_K[-\nu_K] \arrow[l, "Rf_*(\rho)"'] \\
\bigoplus_i\bigoplus_{\nu=0}^{\nu_{P_i}} m_i^2\cdot\mathscr{P}_{P_i}[2\nu-\nu_{P_i}] \arrow[u, two heads, "pr"'] \arrow[r, hook] & L^\vee*L \arrow[u, "eval_P"] & \bigoplus_{\nu=0}^{+\nu_K} Rf_*\mathscr{P}_K[2\nu-\nu_K]\ \oplus\ rest \arrow[l, "\sim"'] \arrow[u, two heads, "Rf_*(pr_{-\nu_K})"'] \\
\bigoplus_i\bigoplus_{\nu=0}^{\nu_{P_i}}\ m_i^2\cdot\mathscr{P}_{P_i}[2\nu-\nu_{P_i}] \arrow[r, hook, shift left] & L*L^\vee \arrow[l, two heads, shift left] \arrow[u, "S", "\sim"'] \arrow[r, "\sim"] & \bigoplus_{\nu=0}^{\nu_K} Rf_*\mathscr{P}_K[2\nu-\nu_K]\ \oplus\ rest \arrow[u, "\sim"'] \arrow[l, bend right=60, "\sim"'] \\
\bigoplus_i\ m_i^2\cdot\mathscr{P}_{P_i}[+\nu_{P_i}] \arrow[u, hook, "i"'] & \delta_0 \arrow[l, "\oplus_i\ tr^\vee\circ\sigma_i"'] \arrow[u, "coev_P"] \arrow[r, "Rf_*(\sigma)"] & Rf_*\mathscr{P}_K[+\nu_K] \arrow[u, hook, "Rf_*(i_{+\nu_K})"']
\end{tikzcd}$$

The lower part of this diagram defines the next commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\bigoplus_i\bigoplus_{\nu=0}^{\nu_{P_i}}\ m_i^2\cdot\mathscr{P}_{P_i}[2\nu-\nu_{P_i}] \arrow[r, hook, shift right, "\mathrm{v}'"'] \arrow[d, bend right, "p"'] & L*L^\vee \arrow[l, two heads, shift right, "\mathrm{v}"'] \arrow[r, two heads, shift right, "u'"'] & \bigoplus_{\nu=0}^{\nu_K} Rf_*\mathscr{P}_K[2\nu-\nu_K] \arrow[l, hook, shift right, "u"'] \arrow[d, bend right, "Rf_*(pr)"'] \\
\bigoplus_i\ m_i^2\cdot\mathscr{P}_{P_i}[+\nu_{P_i}] \arrow[u, hook, "i"'] & \delta_0 \arrow[l, "\oplus_i\ tr^\vee\circ\sigma_i"'] \arrow[u, "coev_P"'] \arrow[r, "Rf_*(\sigma)"] & Rf_*\mathscr{P}_K[+\nu_K] \arrow[u, hook, "Rf_*(i_{+\nu_K})"']
\end{tikzcd}$$

---

[2] For what follows one also could replace **D** by some localization $\mathbf{D_H}$ with respect to a hereditary class **H** (see [KrW]), and then it suffices to assume $Rf_*(K)\in\mathbf{P}_H$. For complex abelian varieties on the other hand the assumption can always be achieved by a generic character twist using the relative vanishing theorem of [KrW].

where the retract morphism u is obtained from the right middle diagram using the isomorphism S taking into account that the coevaluation map of L ignores the part of the last diagram entitled ‘rest’. Altogether this defines a morphism

$$Rf_*\mathscr{P}_K[+\nu_K] \ \longrightarrow\ \bigoplus_i \bigoplus_{\nu=0}^{\nu_{P_i}} m_i^2\cdot\mathscr{P}_{P_i}[2\nu-\nu_{P_i}]$$

whose ‘image’ is contained in $\bigoplus_i\ m_i^2\mathscr{P}_{P_i}[+\nu_{P_i}]$ and, without loosing information, can be considered as a morphism $Rf_*\mathscr{P}_K[+\nu_K]\ \longrightarrow\ \bigoplus_i\ m_i^2\cdot\mathscr{P}_{P_i}[+\nu_{P_i}]$. For $L\neq 0$ from the definition it is clear that for each i the composed morphism

$$Rf_*(\mathscr{P}_K)[+\nu_K]\ \longrightarrow\ \bigoplus_i\ m_i^2\cdot\mathscr{P}_{P_i}[+\nu_{P_i}]\ \longrightarrow\ m_i^2\cdot\mathscr{P}_{P_i}[+\nu_{P_i}]$$

is nontrivial. Indeed, if $pr_i\circ p\circ \mathrm{v}\circ u\circ i_{+\nu_K}$ would be zero, then also the composition with $Rf_*(\sigma)$, which is $tr^\vee\circ\sigma_i\neq 0$, would be zero. The same argument also implies $Rf_*(\sigma)\neq 0$. Hence we can repeat this argument in the other direction to show that the composed morphism $Rf_*(pr)\circ u'\circ \mathrm{v}'\circ i$

$$m_i^2\cdot\mathscr{P}_{P_i}[+\nu_{P_i}]\longrightarrow Rf_*(\mathscr{P}_K[+\nu_K])$$

is also nontrivial, and also their composition. This shows

Proposition 1. *Suppose K is an irreducible perverse sheaf so that the semisimple complex $L=Rf_*(K)=\bigoplus_{i\in I}m_i\cdot P_i$ is perverse and not zero (i.e $m_i>0$). Then for every irreducible perverse constituent P_i of L there exist nontrivial morphisms in the derived category*

$$Rf_*(\mathscr{P}_K)[\nu_K]\ \longrightarrow\ m_i^2\cdot\mathscr{P}_{P_i}[\nu_{P_i}]$$

$$m_i^2\cdot\mathscr{P}_{P_i}[\nu_{P_i}]\ \longrightarrow\ Rf_*(\mathscr{P}_K)[\nu_K]$$

whose composition (in both directions) is not zero.

Then $Hom_{\mathbf{D}}(M,N[r])=0$ for perverse sheaves M,N and $r<0$ implies

Corollary 1. *Suppose K is an irreducible perverse sheaf for which the semisimple complexes $L=Rf_*(K)=\bigoplus_i m_i\cdot P_i$ and $Rf_*(\mathscr{P}_K)$ are perverse with $L\neq 0$. Then $\nu_K=\nu_{P_i}$ holds for all irreducible perverse constituents P_i of L.*

Since $\nu_{P_i} \leq \dim(Y)$, we also obtain from proposition 1

$$Rf_*(K) \neq 0 \text{ and is in } \mathbf{P} \implies \nu_K \leq \dim(Y) \ .$$

Definition. An irreducible perverse sheaf F on X is called *maximal*, if for *every* projection $f : X \to B$ to a simple quotient abelian variety B of X the direct images $Rf_*(K_\chi)$ and $Rf_*(\mathscr{P}_{K_\chi})$ are perverse and not zero for generic character twists χ.

Example. Perverse sheaves in $M(X)$ are maximal.

Define $\mu(X)$ to be the minimum of the dimensions of the simple abelian quotient varieties $B \neq 0$ of X.

Lemma 4. *Suppose K is a maximal irreducible perverse sheaf. If $Rf_*(K_\chi)$ and $Rf_*\mathscr{P}_{K_\chi}$ are perverse for $f : X \to B$ and $\dim(B) = \mu(X)$, then*

$$\boxed{\nu_K \ \leq \ \mu(X)} \ .$$

In case of $\mathrm{char}(k) = 0$ this holds for any maximal perverse sheaf K.

Proof. ν_{K_χ} only depends on K but not on χ (property 8). It is shown in the relative vanishing theorem of [KrW], that for k of characteristic zero one can always assume that $L = Rf_*(K_\chi) = \bigoplus_i m_i \cdot P_i$ and $Rf_*(\mathscr{P}_{K_\chi}) = Rf_*\big(\mathscr{P}_{K\chi}\big)$ are perverse by applying a twist with a suitable generic character $\chi : \pi_1(X,0) \to \Lambda^*$. If K is minimal we can therefore always dispose over the arguments from above. $\square$

We remark that twists with characters $\chi' : \pi_1(B,0) \to \Lambda^*$ have the following effect: $L = \bigoplus_i P_i$ changes into $P_{\chi'} = \bigoplus_i (P_i)_{\chi'}$, $\mathscr{P}_K$ and $\mathscr{P}_{P_i}$ change as well into their χ'-twist. This implies, that the morphisms constructed above are *independent* from twists of K with characters χ' of $\pi_1(B,0)$.

Functors revisited. Suppose given a homomorphism $f : X \to Y$ of abelian varieties and semisimple perverse sheaves K and P (or complexes) on X and some integer ν (by abuse of notation we then again write $\nu = \nu_K$) together with a commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
K^\vee * K \arrow[dd, shift left, "p"] \arrow[dr, "eval_K"] & \\
& \delta_0 \\
P[-\nu_K] \arrow[uu, hook, shift left, "\iota"] \arrow[ur, "\rho"'] &
\end{tikzcd}$$

such that $p \circ \iota = id$. Then $L = Rf_*(K) = \bigoplus_{i \in I} P_i[\lambda_i]$ and $Q = Rf_*(P) = \bigoplus_{j \in J} Q_j[\lambda_j]$ decomposes with simple perverse sheaves P_i and Q_j. With these notations we get

Theorem 1. *For any (shifted perverse) constituent $P_i[\lambda_i] \hookrightarrow L$ there exists a (shifted perverse) constituent $Q_j[\lambda_j] \hookrightarrow Q$ such that*

$$\nu_{Q_j} \leq \mu(Q_j) \leq \nu_K - \lambda_j \leq \nu_{P_i}$$

holds, and a constituent $P_{i'}[\lambda_{i'}] \hookrightarrow L$ such that $\nu_{P_{i'}} \leq \nu_K - \lambda_j$ holds.

Proof. Since Rf_* is a tensor functor, we get the commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
L^\vee * L \arrow[dd, shift left] \arrow[dr, "eval_L"] & \\
& \delta_0 \\
Q[-\nu_K] \arrow[uu, hook, shift left] \arrow[ur, "Rf_*(\rho)"'] &
\end{tikzcd}$$

for the evaluation morphism $eval_L$. For any direct factor $C = P_i[\lambda_i]$ in L the evaluation morphism of $eval_C : C^\vee * C = P_i^\vee[-\lambda_i] * P_i[\lambda_i] = P_i^\vee * P_i \to \delta_0$ is induced by the evaluation morphism $eval_{P_i}$, which is computed via the upper horizontal morphisms of the next commutative diagram. The evaluation $eval_C$ is also obtained as the restriction of the evaluation morphism $eval_L : L^\vee * L \to \delta_0$ to $C^\vee * C \hookrightarrow L^\vee * L$. The evaluation morphism $eval_L$ is given by the lower horizontal morphisms of the next diagram. Altogether this implies the existence of a morphism φ

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathscr{P}_{P_i}[-\nu_{P_i}] \arrow[rr, "\varphi"] \arrow[dr, "\rho_i"'] & & Q[-\nu_K] \arrow[dl, "Rf_*(\rho)"] \\
& \delta_0 &
\end{tikzcd}$$

making the following diagram commutative

$$\begin{tikzcd}
P_i^\vee * P_i = C^\vee * C \arrow[r, two heads, shift left] \arrow[d, hook] & \mathscr{P}_{P_i}[-\nu_{P_i}] \arrow[l, hook, shift left] \arrow[r, "\rho_i"] \arrow[d, "\varphi"] & \delta_0 \arrow[d, equal] \\
L^\vee * L \arrow[r, two heads, shift left] & Q[-\nu_K] \arrow[l, hook, shift left] \arrow[r, two heads] & \delta_0
\end{tikzcd}$$

Now we can decompose $Q[-\nu_K] = \bigoplus_{j\in J} Q_j[\lambda_j - \nu_K]$ and accordingly also the morphism φ, so that for at least one $j \in J$ we get a commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathscr{P}_{P_i}[-\nu_{P_i}] \arrow[rr, "a_j"] \arrow[dr, swap, "b_j"] & & Q_j[\lambda_j - \nu_K] \arrow[dl, "c_j"] \ . \\
& \delta_0 &
\end{tikzcd}$$

with a *nontrivial* morphism b_j, since the morphism $\rho_i = \sum_j b_j$ is not zero. Then of course also $a_j \neq 0$ and $c_j \neq 0$. Now $a_j \neq 0$ implies $-\nu_{P_i} \leq \lambda_j - \nu_K$, and $c_j \neq 0$ implies $\mathscr{H}^0(Q_j[\lambda_j - \nu_K])_0 = \mathscr{H}^{\lambda_j - \nu_P}(Q_j)_0 \neq 0$. Hence $-\nu_{P_i} \leq \lambda_j - \nu_K \leq -\mu(Q_j) \leq -\nu_{Q_j}$.

Reversing the argument conversely we can construct a *nontrivial* morphism

$$\begin{tikzcd}
Q_j[\lambda_j - \nu_K] \arrow[rr] \arrow[dr] & & \mathscr{P}_{P'_i}[-\nu_{P'_i}] \arrow[dl] \\
& \delta_0 &
\end{tikzcd}$$

for some constituent $P_{i'}[\lambda_{i'}] \hookrightarrow L$. $\square$

We define $\nu_Q = \min_j(\nu_{Q_j})$ for the decomposition $Q = \bigoplus_j Q_j[\lambda_j]$ and similarly define $\nu_L = \min_i(\nu_{P_i})$ for the decomposition $L = \bigoplus_i P_i[\lambda_i]$. A constituent $Q_j[\lambda_j]$ respectively $P_i[\lambda_i]$ is called *minimal*, if $\nu_{Q_j} = \nu_Q$ respectively $\nu_{P_i} = \nu_L$ holds. If we apply the last theorem for a minimal constituent $P_i[\lambda_i] \hookrightarrow L$, then the properties $\nu_K - \lambda_j \leq \nu_{P_i} = \nu_L$ and $\nu_L \leq \nu_{P_{i'}} \leq \nu_K - \lambda_j$ imply

$$\nu_{P_{i'}} = \nu_K - \lambda_j = \nu_{P_i} = \nu_L \ .$$

In particular $P_{i'}$ is also minimal and $Q_j[\lambda_j - \nu_K] = Q_j[-\nu_L]$. Furthermore, the nontrivial morphisms

$$a_j : \mathscr{P}_{P_i}[-\nu_{P_i}] = \mathscr{P}_{P_i}[-\nu_L] \longrightarrow Q_j[\lambda_j - \nu_K] = Q_j[-\nu_L]$$

and similarly

$$Q_j[\lambda_j - \nu_K] = Q_j[-\nu_L] \to \mathscr{P}_{P_{i'}}[-\nu_{P_{i'}}] = \mathscr{P}_{P_{i'}}[-\nu_L]$$

imply $Q_j \cong \mathscr{P}_{P_{i'}}$. By lemma 3 the degree of an irreducible perverse sheaf is the degree of its prime perverse sheaf, we conclude $\nu_{Q_j} = \nu_{P_{i'}} = \nu_L$. Hence there is also an isomorphism of shifted perverse sheaves $Q_j \ \cong \ \mathscr{P}_{P_i}$.

Corollary 2. *For every minimal* $P_i[\lambda_i] \hookrightarrow L = Rf_*(K)$ *there exists a prime constituent* $Q_j[\nu_K - \nu_L] \hookrightarrow Q = Rf_*(P)$ *with*

$$Q_j \cong \mathscr{P}_{P_i} \ .$$

An Application. Let $\mathscr{P}$ be a prime perverse sheaf on X, and consider the morphism $a : X \times X \to X$ and the prime perverse sheaf $K = P = \mathscr{P} \boxtimes \mathscr{P}$ on $X \times X$. Then $\nu_K = 2\nu_{\mathscr{P}}$ and $L = Ra_*(K) = \mathscr{P} * \mathscr{P}$. Notice that $\mathscr{P}[-\nu_{\mathscr{P}}] \hookrightarrow \mathscr{P} * \mathscr{P}$ (by lemma 3) implies

$$\nu_L \leq \nu_{\mathscr{P}} \ .$$

Then by the last theorem and corollary the minimal constituents $P_i[\lambda_i]$ give prime constituents $Q_j[\lambda_j] \hookrightarrow L$ such that $\lambda_j = \nu_K - \nu_L = 2\nu_{\mathscr{P}} - \nu_L$, and hence by the last inequality

$$\lambda_j \geq \nu_{\mathscr{P}} \ .$$

Hard Lefschetz. For $Q_j[\lambda_j] \hookrightarrow L$ one has $Q_j[\lambda_j - 2i] \hookrightarrow L$ for all $i = 0, \cdots \lambda_j$. Now since $i = \nu_{\mathscr{P}} \leq \lambda_j$ and $\nu_K = 2\nu_{\mathscr{P}}$, this implies

$$Q_j[\lambda_j - 2\nu_{\mathscr{P}}] = Q_j[-\nu_L] \hookrightarrow L \ .$$

But also $\mathscr{H}^0(Q_j[-\nu_L])_0 \neq 0$, since Q_j is a prime perverse sheaf and it is minimal. By lemma 1.6 on the other hand there is a unique (shifted perverse) constituent in $L = \mathscr{P} * \mathscr{P}$ with this property, namely $\mathscr{P}[-\nu_{\mathscr{P}}]$. Hence $Q_j[-\nu_L] \cong \mathscr{P}[-\nu_{\mathscr{P}}]$ and therefore $Q_j[\lambda_j] \cong \mathscr{P}[+\nu_{\mathscr{P}}]$.

This proves

Lemma 5. *For a prime* $\mathscr{P}$ *on* X *we have* $\nu_{\mathscr{P}*\mathscr{P}} = \nu_{\mathscr{P}}$. *All minimal (shifted perverse) constituents* $Q_j[\lambda_j] \hookrightarrow \mathscr{P} * \mathscr{P}$ *attached to minimal (shifted perverse) constituents* $P_i[\lambda_i] \hookrightarrow \mathscr{P} * \mathscr{P}$ *are isomorphic to* $\mathscr{P}[+\nu_{\mathscr{P}}] \cong \mathscr{P}_{P_i}[\lambda_j]$.

For X let $\nu_+(X)$ be the maximum of all $\nu_{\mathscr{P}}$ for the irreducible prime perverse sheaves $\mathscr{P}$ on X with the property $\nu_{\mathscr{P}} < \dim(X)$. For *maximal* primes $\mathscr{P}$ on X, i.e. $\nu_{\mathscr{P}} = \nu_+(X)$, we then get

Corollary 3. *Suppose* $\mathscr{P}$ *is a maximal irreducible perverse prime on* X. *Then* $\mathscr{P} * \mathscr{P} \cong \bigoplus_i P_i[\lambda_i]$ *such that either* $\mathscr{P}_{P_i} \cong \mathscr{P}$ *or* $\mathscr{P}_{P_i} \cong \delta_X^{\varphi_i}$.

Proof. For $L = \mathscr{P} * \mathscr{P}$ we have shown $\nu_L = \nu_{\mathscr{P}*\mathscr{P}} = \nu_{\mathscr{P}}$. Hence for maximal $\mathscr{P}$ there are no (shifted perverse) constituents in $L = \mathscr{P} * \mathscr{P}$ with $\nu_{P_i} > \nu_L$ except for $\mathscr{P}_{P_i} \cong \delta_X^{\varphi_i}$ by lemma 1, part 2. $\square$

Corollary 4. *Suppose K is an irreducible prime perverse sheaf on X with finite stabilizer H. Then for $\pi : X \to X/H$ the direct image $L = \pi_*(K)$ is $L \cong \bigoplus_{\chi\in H^*} P_\chi$ for a prime P on X/H with trivial stabilizer and $\nu_P = \nu_K$. Suppose K is an irreducible prime perverse sheaf on X with trivial stabilizer H. Then for any isogeny $\pi : X \to Y$ the perverse sheaf $L = \pi_*(K)$ is an irreducible prime perverse sheaf on Y with trivial stabilizer and the property $\nu_L = \nu_K$.*

Proof. By corollary 1 we have $L = \bigoplus_i P_i$ and $\nu_{P_i} = \nu_K$ and $\mathscr{P}(P_i) \cong P_i$ for all simple constituents P_i. Since $Hom_{\mathbf{D}}(P_i, L) = Hom_{\mathbf{D}}(P_i, \pi_*(K)) = Hom_{\mathbf{D}}(\pi^*(P_i), K)$ and since L is semisimple and K is irreducible, there exist a surjective exact sequence of perverse sheaves on X

$$0 \to U_i \to \pi^*(P_i) \to K \to 0 \ .$$

Now for $P_i = P$ the direct image $\pi_*\pi^*(P) = \bigoplus_{\chi\in H^*} P_\chi$ has $\#H^* = \#H$ simple constituents. Applying the direct image to the exact sequence considered above for $P_i = P$ we get

$$0 \to \pi_*(U) \to \bigoplus_{\chi\in H^*} P_\chi \to L \to 0 \ .$$

Since also $L = \pi_*(K)$ has $\#H$ simple constituents as shown above, therefore $\pi_*(U) = 0$. Since π is finite, hence $U = 0$ and $L \cong \bigoplus_{\chi\in H^*} P_\chi$. This proves the first assertions.

Now we come to the case where K is a prime perverse sheaf with trivial stabilizer and $\pi : X \to Y$ is an isogeny. The discussion above carries over verbatim except that now $\mathscr{H}^{-\nu_K}(L) = \delta_0$. Therefore similarly as above one can show that $L = P$ is an irreducible prime perverse sheaf on Y. ☐

Corollary 5. *Suppose $\pi : X \to Y$ is a separable isogeny and K is an irreducible prime perverse sheaf on Y with pullback $L = \pi^*(K)$. Then there exists an irreducible prime perverse sheaf F with $\nu_F = \nu_K$ such that L is isomorphic to the direct sum of translates $T_x^*(F)$, where x runs over the cosets of $Kern(\pi)/Kern_F(\pi)$ for $Kern_F(\pi) = \{x \in Kern(\pi) \mid T_x^*(F) \cong F\}$. Furthermore $K_\chi \cong K$ holds for all χ whose pullback $\chi \circ \pi_1(\tilde\pi)$ with respect to the isogeny $\tilde\pi : X/Kern_F(\pi) \to Y$ becomes trivial.*

Proof. By etale descent one can show for an irreducible perverse sheaf $K \in \mathbf{P}$ the pullback $L = \pi^*(K)$ is a semisimple perverse sheaf and that the translations T_x^* for $x \in Kern(\pi)$ act transitively on its simple constituents. Hence $L = \bigoplus_i F_i$ for certain irreducible perverse sheaves F_i. Obviously $\mu(K) = \nu_K \leq \mu(F_i)$. Notice that $\pi_*(L) = \pi_*\pi^*(K) = \bigoplus_\chi K_\chi$ implies $\pi_*(F_i) \cong K_\chi$ for some χ. Since $\mu(F_i) = \mu(\pi_*(F_i))$, therefore $\nu_K \le \mu(F_i) = \mu(\pi_*(F_i)) = \mu(K_\chi) = \nu_K$ and this implies $\mu(F_i) = \nu_K$. Hence $\nu_{F_i} \le \nu_K$. But $\pi_*(F_i) \cong K_\chi$ also implies $\nu_{F_i} = \nu_K$ by corollary 1. This shows $\mu(F_i) = \nu_{F_i} = \nu_K$ for all i. Hence all F_i are extremal and therefore $F_i \cong T^*_{x_i}(F)$ holds for certain $x_i \in X$, where F is the unique constituent of $L = \pi^*(K)$ with the property $\mathscr{H}^{-\nu_K}(F)_0 \cong \mathscr{H}^{-\nu_K}(L)_0 \cong \mathscr{H}^{-\nu_K}(K)_0 \cong \Lambda$. In particular F is a prime perverse sheaf on X and L is a direct sum of translates of F. This proves the first assertions.

Since F is invariant under translation by $Kern_F(\pi)$, F descends to a perverse sheaf on $X/Kern_F(\pi)$ in the sense that $F \cong p^*(\tilde{F})$ for $p : X \to X/Kern_F(\pi)$ and $\tilde{F}$ is a constituent of $\tilde{\pi}^*(K)$. Then $Kern_{\tilde{F}}(\tilde{\pi}) = 0$. We may therefore replace π by $\tilde{\pi}$, So for the remaining statement we can assume $Kern_F(\pi) = 0$ without restriction of generality. Then $L = \bigoplus_{x \in Kern(\pi)} T^*_x(F)$ and hence $\pi_*(L) = \#Kern(\pi) \cdot \pi_*(F)$. On the other hand $\pi_*(L) = \bigoplus_{\chi \in Kern(\pi)^*} K_\chi$. Both together implies that $K_\chi \cong K$ holds for all characters χ for which $\chi \circ \pi_1(\tilde{\pi})$ becomes trivial. ☐

Quasi-idempotents. We either work in $\mathbf{D}$ or in a hereditary localization $\mathbf{D_H}$ of $\mathbf{D}$ with respect to some hereditary class $\mathbf{H}$ as defined in [KrW], possibly of course also $\mathbf{D_H} = \mathbf{D}$. Notice $Hom_{\mathbf{D_H}}(P, \mathbf{D_H}^{>0}) = 0$ for the image of a perverse sheaf P in $\mathbf{D_H}$. For details and notation we refer to [KrW].

Fix an integer d. In the following let $H^\bullet$ denote graded Λ-vector spaces such that $H^i = 0$ for $|i| > d$. Suppose $P(X)$ is a class of irreducible perverse sheaves on X, closed under Tannaka duality such that in $\mathbf{D}$

$$K, L \in P(X) \implies K * L \ \cong\ \bigoplus_{i \in I} H^\bullet(K, L, P_i) \cdot P_i \quad \oplus \quad T$$

for some complex T in $\mathbf{N_H}$ and P_i in $P(X)$ such that $P_i \ncong P_j$ holds for $i \neq j$.

Lemma 6. *Suppose $P \in P(X)$ and $\mathscr{H}^{-d}(P)_0 \neq 0$. Then $L[-d] \hookrightarrow K * P$ for $K, L \in P(X)$ but not in $\mathbf{N}$ implies $K \cong L$.*

Proof. $Hom_{\mathbf{D_H}}(K * P, L[-d]) \neq 0$ implies $Hom_{\mathbf{D_H}}(P, K^\vee * L[-d]) \neq 0$. Furthermore $K^\vee * L[-d] = \bigoplus_{i \in I} H^\bullet(K^\vee, L, P_i) \cdot P_i[-d]$ is contained in $\bigoplus_{i \in I} P_i \oplus \mathbf{D_H}^{>0}$. Therefore $Hom_{\mathbf{D_H}}(P, \ \bigoplus_{i \in I} P_i\ ) \ \neq 0$ and this implies $Hom_{\mathbf{D_H}}(P, P_i) \neq 0$ for at least one $i \in I$. Hence $Hom_{\mathbf{P}}(P, P_i) \neq 0$ by [KrW, lemma 25], since P and P_i are simple perverse sheaves, so that $P_i \cong P$ are isomorphic as perverse sheaves. This and the hard Lefschetz theorem define in $\mathbf{D}$ a retract $P[-d] \cong P_i[-d] \hookrightarrow H^\bullet(K^\vee, L, P_i) \cdot P_i \hookrightarrow K^\vee * L$. Since $\mathscr{H}^0(P[-d])^*_0 \neq 0$, then $Hom_{\mathbf{D}}(L, K) = Hom_{\mathbf{D}}(K^\vee * L, \delta_0) = \mathscr{H}^0(K^\vee * L)^*_0 \neq 0$ and hence $L \cong K$. ☐

For the next lemma in addition we assume that for $K, P, L \in P(X)$ vanishing $H^{-d}(K, P, L) = 0$ in degree $-d$ implies $H^\bullet(K, P, L) = 0$.

Lemma 7. *For* $P \in P(X)$ *assume* $\mathscr{H}^{-d}(P)_0 \neq 0$. *Then for* $K \in P(X)$

$$K * P = H^\bullet(K,P,K) \cdot K \qquad (\textit{ in } \mathbf{D_H}) \ .$$

For primes $P \in P(X)$ *not in* $\mathbf{N}$ *with* $\nu_P = d$ *then* $\dim(H^{-d}(P,P,P)) = 1$ *and*

$$P * P = H^\bullet(P,P,P) \cdot P \ ;$$

furthermore for $K \in P(X)$ *either* $H^\bullet(K,P,K) = H^\bullet(P,P,P)$ *or* $H^\bullet(K,P,K) = 0$. *In particular* $P' * P = 0$ *in* $\mathbf{D_H}$ *for all primes* $P' \ncong P$ *with the property* $\nu_{P'} = d$ *and* $P' \in P(X)$ *but* $P' \notin \mathbf{N}$.

Proof. $K * P = \bigoplus_{i \in I} H^\bullet(K,P,L_i) \cdot L_i$ for $L_i \in P(X)$ implies $L_i[-d] \hookrightarrow K * P$, if $H^\bullet(K,P,L_i) \neq 0$. Then $L_i \cong K$ as shown in the last lemma. Next $\dim(H^{-d}(P,P,P))$ for primes $P = \mathscr{P}$ with $\nu_P = d$ counts the multiplicity of $\mathscr{P}[d]$ as a summand $\mathscr{P}[d] \hookrightarrow \mathscr{P}^{*2}$. This multiplicity is one by lemma 1, part 6 and the formula $\mathscr{P}_{\mathscr{P}} = \mathscr{P}$ of lemma 4. Now use $H^\bullet(K,P,K) \cdot K * P = (K * P) * P \cong K * (P * P) = H^\bullet(P,P,P) \cdot K * P$ in $\mathbf{D_H}$. Finally, if $P * P' \neq 0$ in $\mathbf{D_H}$, then $P * P' \cong H^\bullet(P,P',P) \cdot P = H^\bullet(P,P,P) \cdot P$. A comparison in degree $-d$ with the similar formula with P replaced by P' gives $P \cong P'$. $\square$

We remark that in the above setting $P \cong \mathscr{P}_K$ implies $H^\bullet(K,P,K) \neq 0$.

Quasi-idempotent complexes. For given $L = \bigoplus_{i=-r}^{r} L_i[-i]$ with semisimple perverse sheaves L_i assume

1. $L \cong L^\vee$ and $L_{-r} \cong L_r \neq 0$.
2. $L * L \cong H^\bullet \cdot L$ for $pr_d : H^d \cong \Lambda[-d]$ and $H^i = 0$ for $|i| > d$.
3. There exists a commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
L^\vee * L \arrow[r, "\sim"] \arrow[ddrr, "eval_L"'] & L * L \arrow[r] & H^\bullet \cdot L \arrow[d, "pr_d"'] \\
 & & H^d \cdot L \cong L[-d] \arrow[d] \\
 & & \delta_0
\end{tikzcd}$$

Then H is selfdual and $H^{\pm d} \cong \Lambda$. These condition also imply

$$H^\bullet \cdot \mathscr{H}^\bullet(L)_0 \cong H^\bullet(X, L \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} D(L)) \ ,$$

and both sides are independent of character twists, i.e. do not change under replacing L by L_χ. Notice $L_r^\vee \cong L_{-r} \cong L_r$.

Since $L_r * L_r \neq 0$ (otherwise $eval_{L_r} = 0$ and hence $L_r = 0$), then $2r \leq d + r$, i.e. $r \leq d$. Let $\nu(L)$ denote the minimum of all ν_C for an irreducible perverse constituent C of some L_i. For the perverse amplitude $a(L_i, L_i)$ of $L_i * L_i$ for $C \hookrightarrow L_i$ we have $\nu_C \leq a(L_i, L_i) \leq d + r - 2i$. For $i = r$ this implies $C \hookrightarrow L_r \implies \nu_C \leq d - r$, and hence $\nu(L) \leq \nu_C \leq d - r$ or

$$r \leq d - \nu(L) \ .$$

The evaluation morphism $eval_C = eval_{C[i]}$ of the direct summand $C^\vee * C = C[i]^\vee * C[i] \hookrightarrow L^\vee * L$ is obtained by restriction of the evaluation $eval_L$. Hence by property 3) there exists a commuative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathscr{P}_C[-\nu_C] \arrow[rr, "a"] \arrow[dr, "eval_C"'] & & P_j[\lambda_j - d] \arrow[dl, "b"] \\
& \delta_0 &
\end{tikzcd}$$

for some (shifted) irreducible summand $P_j \hookrightarrow L_{-\lambda_j}$

$$P_j[\lambda_j] \hookrightarrow L \ .$$

Then $-\nu_C \leq \lambda_j - d$ and $\lambda_j - d \leq -\mu(P_j) \leq -\nu_{P_j}$ are necessary conditions for a respectively b to be non-trivial. Hence $\nu_{P_j} \leq \mu(P_j) \leq d - \lambda_j \leq \nu_C$. For minimal C, i.e. with $\nu_C = \nu(L)$, this implies the equalities $\nu_{P_j} = \mu(P_j) = d - \lambda_j = \nu_C = \nu(L)$ and then from the first equality $\mathscr{P}_C \cong P_j$ and P_j is again minimal. Notice $\lambda_j = d - \nu(L)$ and hence $r \leq \lambda_j$ by one of the inequalities above. Then of course $\lambda_j = r$ and therefore $P_j[\lambda_j] \hookrightarrow L_{-r}[r]$, and then also

$$P_j \hookrightarrow L_{-r} \quad , \quad r + \nu(L) = d \ .$$

Thus we found a multi-map from minimal constituents C in L to perverse minimal prime constituents P_j in L_r. On the other hand $L_r^\vee \cong L_{-r} \cong L_r$, so for C in L_r we get $\mathscr{P}_C[\nu_C] \hookrightarrow C^\vee * C \hookrightarrow L_r * L_r$. On the other hand we found $\nu_C \leq a(L_r, L_r) \leq d - r$, so by the result $d - r = \nu(L)$ from above this implies $\nu_C \leq \nu(L)$. In other words all perverse constituents C of L_r are minimal, and $a(L_r, L_r) = \nu(L)$. We claim that this implies that all perverse constituents of L_{-r} (and hence of L_r) are primes and that $L_{\pm r}$ is multiplicity free.

Proposition 2. *Under the assumptions 1)-3) on L the top and bottom perverse sheaves $L_r \cong L_{-r} = \bigoplus_j m_j \cdot K_j$ are multiplicity free, i.e. $m_j = 1$ holds, and all the constituents K_j are prime perverse sheaves with $\nu_{K_j} = d - r$.*

Proof. Recall $(L_{-r})^\vee \cong L_r \cong L_{-r}$. Therefore $m(K) = m(K^\vee)$ holds for the multiplicities $m(K)$ and $m(K^\vee)$ of K and $K^\vee$ in L_{-r}, and hence for $m_j = m(K_j)$

$$\bigoplus_j m_j^2 \cdot \mathscr{P}_{K_j}[\nu_{K_j} + 2r] \hookrightarrow \bigoplus_j m_j^2 \cdot K_j^\vee[r] * K_j[r] \hookrightarrow L_{-r}[r] * L_{-r}[r] \hookrightarrow L * L \cong H^\bullet \cdot L \ .$$

Since all K_j in L_{-r} are minimal, we get $\nu_{K_j} = \nu(L)$. Then $\nu(L) + 2r = d + r$ implies

$$\bigoplus_j m_j^2 \cdot \mathscr{P}_{K_j} \hookrightarrow H^\bullet \cdot L[-d-r] \ .$$

Therefore $\bigoplus_j \ m_j^2 \cdot \mathscr{P}_{K_j} \hookrightarrow H^{-d} \cdot L_{-r} \cong L_{-r}$ and $\sum_{j, \mathscr{P}_{K_j} = \mathscr{P}} m_j^2 \leq m(\mathscr{P})$. Since $K \in L_{\pm r}$ implies $\mathscr{P} = \mathscr{P}_K \in L_{\pm r}$, by the minimality therefore $m(\mathscr{P}) = 1$ and $m_j = 0$ holds for all K_j which are not primes. ☐

Additional Axioms. Let $L(X)$ denote the isomorphism classes of simple constituents $P_j[\lambda_j]$ of the semisimple complex $L = \bigoplus_j m_j \cdot P_j[\lambda_j]$ with P_j in $\mathbf{P}$. Then $L(X)$ is closed under Tannaka duality such that for K, L in $L(X)$

$$K, L \in P(X) \implies K * L \ \cong \ \bigoplus_{i \in I} H^\bullet(K, L, P_i) \cdot P_i$$

holds for certain P_i in $L(X)$; again we assume $P_i \ncong P_j$ for $i \neq j$. Then $H^i(K, L, Q) = 0$ holds for $|i| > d$, $L * L \cong H^\bullet \cdot L$. In addition to the properties 1)-3) for L now assume the further properties: 4) $H^\bullet(K, L, P_i) \neq 0$ implies $H^{-d}(K, L, P_i) \neq 0$ and: 5) $H^\bullet(K, P, L_i) \neq 0$ implies $H^{+d}(K, P, L_i) \neq 0$. For primes $\mathscr{P} \in L_{-r}$ now put

$$P := \mathscr{P}[r] \ \in \ L_{-r}[r] \hookrightarrow L \ .$$

Then $P \in L(X)$ and $\mathscr{H}^{-d}(P)_0 = \mathscr{H}^{-\nu_{\mathscr{P}}}(\mathscr{P})_0 \neq 0$ holds, as well as $Hom_{\mathbf{D}}(P, P_i) \neq 0 \Longrightarrow P \cong P_i$ for all $P_i \in L(X)$. Finally $P[d] \hookrightarrow P * P$ is equivalent to $\mathscr{P}[\nu_{\mathscr{P}}] = \mathscr{P}[d - r] \hookrightarrow \mathscr{P} * \mathscr{P}$, so that again $\dim(H^{-d}(P, P, P)) = 1$. By a careful examination of the proofs of lemma 6 and 7 this shows that all arguments of the proofs of these two lemmas carry over verbatim in our new setting. We obtain

Proposition 3. *Assume L is a complex with the properties 1)-5) from above. Then for any prime $\mathscr{P}$ in $L_{-r} \cong L_r$ and $P := \mathscr{P}[r] \in L$ for $K \in L(X)$ we have in* $\mathbf{D}$

$$K * P = H^\bullet(P, P, P) \cdot K \quad \text{or} \quad K * P = 0 \ .$$

with $H^{-d}(P,P,P)\cong\Lambda[d]$. *In particular for nonisomorphic primes* $\mathscr{P}$ *and* $\mathscr{P}'$ *in* L_{-r} *we get* $\mathscr{P}*\mathscr{P}'=0$. *Hence* L *decomposes* $L=\bigoplus_{\mathscr{P}}L_{\mathscr{P}}$ *such that* $(L_{\mathscr{P}})_{-r}\cong\mathscr{P}[r]$ *and* $L_{\mathscr{P}}*L_{\mathscr{P}'}=0$ *for* $\mathscr{P}'\ncong\mathscr{P}$.

Example. Suppose $\mathscr{P}*\mathscr{P}\cong H^\bullet(\mathscr{P})\cdot\mathscr{P}\oplus T$ for a prime perverse sheaf $\mathscr{P}$ on Y with $\nu_{\mathscr{P}}=d$, $H^{\pm d}\neq 0$ and a complex T. Suppose $f:Y\to X$ has the property $Rf_*(T)\in\mathbf{H}$ and $Rf_*(\mathscr{P})\in\mathbf{P_H}$; in other words $Rf_*(\mathscr{P})=\bigoplus_{i=1}^r m_i\cdot P_i\oplus T'$ for perverse sheaves P_i and a complex $T'\in\mathbf{H}$. Then $P(X)=\{P_1,...,P_r\}$ has the properties formulated above. All P_i are primes by proposition 2 (we have to use the analog of corollary for the category $\mathbf{D_H}$ instead of $\mathbf{D}$. Obviously $P_i*P_j\in P(X)$, since it is a retract of $Rf_*(\mathscr{P})^{*2}=Rf_*(\mathscr{P}^{*2})=Rf_*(H^\bullet(\mathscr{P})\cdot\mathscr{P}\oplus T)$, which is $H^\bullet(\mathscr{P})\cdot Rf_*(\mathscr{P})$ in $\mathbf{D_H}$. Also $P(X)$ is closed under the Tannaka duality as an immediate consequence of $\mathscr{P}^\vee\cong\mathscr{P}$. Finally $\nu_{\mathscr{P}_i}=\nu_{\mathscr{P}}=d$ holds by corollary 1 (its $\mathbf{D_H}$ version).

Cohomology. For irreducible $K\in Perv(X)$ define $\mathscr{S}(K)$ as the set of characters χ such that $H^\bullet(X,K_\chi)\neq H^0(X,K_\chi)$. For $\chi\in\mathscr{S}(K)$ define $h_\chi(K)$ to be the maximal i such that $H^i(X,K_\chi)\neq 0$. By the hard Lefschetz theorem $H^i(X,K_\chi)=0$ holds for $|i|>h_\chi(K)$ and $h_\chi(K)=h_\chi(K^\vee)\geq 0$.

For $K\in E(X)$ the property $H^\bullet(X,K_\chi)=H^0(X,K_\chi)$ is equivalent to $H^\bullet(X,K_\chi)=0$ using the preservation of the Euler characteristic under character twists. Hence for $\nu_K>0$ this shows $\chi\in\mathscr{S}(K)$ iff $H^\bullet(X,K_\chi)\neq 0$. Hence $\mathscr{P}_K[\pm\nu_K]\hookrightarrow K*K^\vee$ and $K[\pm\nu_K]\hookrightarrow K*\mathscr{P}_K$ imply

$$\boxed{\nu_K>0 \implies \mathscr{S}(\mathscr{P}_K)=\mathscr{S}(K)}\ .$$

Furthermore $h_\chi(\mathscr{P}_K)+\nu_K\leq h_\chi(K)+h_\chi(K^\vee)$ and $h_\chi(K)+\nu_K\leq h_\chi(K)+h_\chi(\mathscr{P}_K)$ imply

$$\boxed{\nu_K\ \leq\ h_\chi(\mathscr{P}_K)\qquad\text{for }\chi\in\mathscr{S}(K)}\ .$$

Hence we can write $h_\chi(K)=\nu_K+e_\chi(K)$ so that for all $\chi\in\mathscr{S}(K)$ we obtain inequalities

$$\boxed{0\ \leq\ e_\chi(\mathscr{P}_K)\leq 2\cdot e_\chi(K)}\qquad\text{for }\chi\in\mathscr{S}(K)\ .$$

Relative case. For a homomorphsm $f:X\to Y$ define $h_\chi^f(K)$ for all χ such that $Rf_*(K_\chi)\neq 0$ to be the maximal i such that ${}^pH^i(Rf_*(K_\chi))\neq 0$. Since $H^k(X,K_\chi)=\bigoplus_{i+j=k}H^i(X,{}^pH^j(B,Rf_*(K_\chi)))$ by the decomposition theorem, we obtain

$$h_\chi(K)\ =\ \max_j\big(j+h({}^pH^j(Rf_*(K_\chi)))\big)$$

where the maximum is taken over all j such that ${}^pH^j(Rf_*(K_\chi)) \neq 0$ where $h(F) := h_1(F)$. If $Rf_*(K_\chi) \neq 0$ is perverse, then $h_\chi(K) = h(Rf_*(K_\chi))$. For all $\chi \in \mathscr{S}(K)$

$$h_\chi(K) \ \leq \ \dim(A) + h_\chi\big(\bigoplus_i {}^pH^i(Rf_*(K_\chi))\big) \ .$$

Let $P = K$ be an irreducible prime perverse sheaf on X and $f : X \to Y$ be a homomorphism. Then for every irreducible constituent $Q_j[\lambda_j]$ of $L = Rf_*(P)$ with perverse Q_j we have $h(P) \geq h(Q_j) + a_f(Q_j) \geq h(Q_j) + \lambda_j$, where $a_f(Q) = \max\{\lambda | Q[\lambda] \hookrightarrow L\}$ for a perverse sheaf Q. On the other hand by theorem 1 for every constituent $P_i[\lambda_i] \hookrightarrow L$ there exists some irreducible perverse sheaf Q_j with $Q_j[\lambda_j] \hookrightarrow L$ and $\nu_P - \lambda_j \leq \nu_{P_i}$. For this particular $Q_j[\lambda_j]$ we conclude $\nu_P \leq \lambda_j + \nu_{P_i}$. Now $-\nu_P \geq -\lambda_j - \nu_{P_i}$ together with $h(P) \geq h(Q_j) + \lambda_j$ gives the estimate $e(P) = h(P) - \nu_P \geq h(Q_j) - \nu_{P_i}$. If P_i is chosen minimal, then $Q_j \cong \mathscr{P}_{P_i}$ by corollary 2. Therefore $e(Q_j) = h(Q_j) - \nu_{Q_j} = h(Q_j) - \nu_{P_i}$. So corollary 2 implies

Lemma 8. *For a prime perverse sheaf P on X and a homomorphism $f : X \to Y$ there exists a prime perverse sheaf Q on Y such that $Q[\nu_P - \nu_L] \hookrightarrow Rf_*(P)$ holds and $e(Q) \leq e(P)$. Furthermore $Q[\nu_P - \nu_L]$ is a minimal constituent of $Rf_*(P)$.*

References

[BBD] Belinson A., Bernstein J., Deligne P., *Faiscaux pervers*, Asterisque 100 (1982)

[D] Deligne P., *Categories Tensorielles*, Moscow Math. Journal, vol. 2, n.2, (2002), 227 - 248

[KrW] Krämer T., Weissauer R., *Vanishing theorems for constructible sheaves on abelian varieties*, arXiv:1111.4947v2 (2011)

[BN] Weissauer R., *Brill-Noether sheaves*, arXiv:math/0610923v4 (2007)

[W2] Weissauer R., *A remark on the rigidity of BN-sheaves*, arXiv:1111.6095 (2011)